

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 296 480

EA 020 190

AUTHOR Kanpol, Barry
TITLE The Hidden Curriculum as Emancipatory and Non-Emancipatory Tools.
PUB DATE Apr 88
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 5-9, 1988). Contains some faint and broken print.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Hidden Curriculum; *Moral Values; School Policy; School Surveys; *Social Attitudes; *Social Values; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

Moral values implied in school practices and policies constitute the "hidden curriculum." Because the hidden curriculum may promote certain moral values to students, teachers are partially responsible for the moral education of students. A component of the hidden curriculum, institutional political resistance, concerns teacher opposition to organizational constraints and may involve the violation of official rules and curricular guidelines. Such resistance alone cannot result in mental "emancipation" or a socially critical mentality. Only questioning and reasoning can oppose the prevailing institutional values. The observation of four anonymous eighth-grade teachers at an urban middle school substantiates this claim. For instance, one of the teachers implied the ethic of pragmatism by using a third-grade level story rather than the official curricular text in a class containing a number of Cambodian refugees. This kind of resistance and the ethic it implied failed to emancipate students because the implied ethic supported conventional, institutional ideologies. On the other hand, cultural political resistance emancipates students, either consciously or unconsciously. One of the teachers consciously emancipated students by articulating her concerns about equality; another teacher unconsciously caused students to question their work assignments by demonstrating frustration and directing critical language toward the administration. However, these teachers mostly stressed institutional values rather than questioned these values. Included are 22 references. (RG)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED296480

THE HIDDEN CURRICULUM AS EMANCIPATORY AND NON EMANCIPATORY TOOLS

Barry Kanpol
University of North Carolina
at Greensboro
Department of Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Kanpol

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational
Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, April 5-9, 1988.

EA 020190

The Hidden Curriculum as Emancipatory and Non Emancipatory Tools
Introduction

In recent times, the attempt to develop a radical theory of schooling has undergone both major and fundamental revisions. Central to these revisions have been the rejection of functional views or "models" of the social system. That is, the seeming "fit" of the correspondence principle - the mirroring of the school with the industrial/bureaucratic infrastructure - has been severely critisized and found lacking. It has been argued, that as part of the superstructure, schools not only reflect the economic base, but can run counter to it as well. Indeed, a plethora of significant and influential radical literature has emerged depicting schools as sites of social struggle. Indeed, optimistically, it has been shown that schools are not just passive clienteles of dominant ideologies. When all said and done however, this literature has viewed the social order in deep structural ways such as those brilliantly elaborated on by Paul Willis (1977) - penetrations, limitations, divisions, etc - that in its final outcomes simply reproduced the economic inequalities that the functionalist paradigm it was critisizing had already successfully accomplished.

On a more optomistic tack, the works of Willis, Henry Giroux (1987, 1988), Robert Bullough Jr. and Andrew Gitlin (1985), Dennis Carlson (1987), Richard Altenbaugh (1987), and H. Svi Shapiro (1988) to name only a few, do represent a growing body of radical education theorists who see society, especially a

061020190
 5A 020 43

capitalist society, as laden with contradictory barriers that impede on the transformative change agenda that each proposes. Commonly, in their analyses of schools, they propose that 1) we cannot assume an entirely integrated (as the functionalists would have it) and ordered set of meanings. Contest and struggle will indubitably effect the larger ideological terrain of which schools are a part. 2) Through these areas of contestation, a counter hegemonic agenda, according to these theorists, is quintessential to better a society where in general, schools harbour on IQ results to depict probable outcomes for student achievement, where standardized teacher evaluation procedures exist and are so frequently rigid and dehumanizing, and where teacher burn out is at an ever rampant pace - over work, too many tasks besides the major one - educating our young for citizenship.

To date, this radical education literature has shown extraordinary sensitivity to issues of disjuncture and conflict, and possibilities and limitations of change (albeit resistance) particularly in students lives. Yet, sparse attention has been granted to teacher so-called resistance - that is, contest and struggle that resocsitates "hope" for transforming consciousness resonating change on an emancipatory level.

For the theorists/researchers mentioned already, the transformation of consciousness has something directly to do with the hidden curriculum. Since its inception, the 'hidden curriculum' has undergone serious scrutiny, both on conceptual

(Gordon, 1982), practical and moral levels. From the works of Phillip Jackson (1968) to Robert Dreehan (1968, 1973) and Seymore Sarason (1973), to ethnographies of Paul Willis (1977) and to Jean Anyon (1980, 1981), to the theoretical orientation of Michael Apple (1982, 1986) and Henry Giroux (1983, 1986, 1988), and to the practical experiences of Paulo Friere (1973, 1985), what has ensued are both major and fundamental revisions as to the nature of the 'hidden curriculum' and its relation to teachers and students at the school site and in the social order.

In my own recently completed work, (Kanpol, 1987), what exactly made up the 'hidden curriculum' also became an agenda to seriously consider. My study dealt with four eighth grade teachers at an urban middle school setting I shall call Hillview - their anxieties, short and long term hopes, frustrations with the administration and their own types of pedagogies. With this in mind, I would like to first look at the concept of the 'hidden curriculum'. Second, in the writing and thinking about what constitutes "emancipation," I will make a distinction between two types of teacher resistances - institutionanl political resistance and cultural political resistance, and relate them to the emancipatory agenda that critical educational theorists mentioned above are dialoguing about. My hope is that the above distinction related to my own study (Kanpol, 1987) will open avenues for further thought about the nature of the hidden curriculum and its emancipatory and non-emancipatory effects.

The Hidden Curriculum

The concept of the 'hidden curriculum' refers to implicit, tacit, unstated or otherwise put, ideological assumptions. These assumptions assume basic moral, philosophical and political "world views" and are contained in school practices and policies - official documents such as the overt curriculum and teacher handbooks for instance. They are "hidden" as there is a lack of awareness or a deception that involves either teacher or student. In short, the hidden curriculum may for instance promote particular cultural values, such as competition, success, achievement, the prizing of individual accomplishments, the sharing or not sharing of a common vision, qualifications and deferred gratification. The 'hidden curriculum' also teaches other social virtues: punctuality, deference and docility, for instance. It prepares students for work in the labor force - sometimes, it has been argued, in clearly unjust ways. On an even more subtle note, the hidden curriculum in schools may include teaching students about sexual and racial stereotypes - without intent, schools may promote sexism and racism. As a result, we teachers, are involved in moral education and are held responsible for making our students good citizens. It is in great part then, that both the overt and hidden curriculum taught will determine our sense of morality and justice. Indeed, this will directly concern the students we are teaching.

What do we learn from this very short expose on the hidden curriculum? To try and answer this question, I will first allude to a distinction between teacher institutional political resistance and cultural political resistance, and show how both may be referred to as part of the hidden curriculum. After presenting snippets from my own study that had to do with the eighth grade 'teachers' use of the hidden curriculum, I will discuss their effects, and, in doing so, try to nudge emancipatory agenda along just a little further.

Institutional Political Resistance and Cultural Political Resistance.

Institutional political resistance involves teachers both individually or as a group resisting structural constraints. This may involve the breaching of certain official rules, like having parties in class when one is not supposed to, not standing outside one's door at a designated time, arriving late to organized meetings for reasons that have to do with one's perception that such events are a waste of time, and questioning and fighting for teacher rights, such as access to personnel information. This resistance may also include a move to more pragmatic curriculum uses rather than following stringent official guidelines. Put differently, this resistance is oppositional! Additionally, teachers may withdraw their consent to the "teacher-administrator exchange" (Willis, 1977) manifested or exhibited at least in part, through a particular language code used by teachers that depicts their opposition and rule-breaking

activities. This type of resistance can be referred to as "macho-militancy," where teachers take it upon themselves to flex some muscle so as their voices both as individuals and as a group can be heard. In short, teachers better control their lives at school by engaging in this type of resistance. Importantly, institutional political resistance, involving the questioning and penetrations of structural facets of schooling, may be a first step leading to emancipatory praxis. By no means though, is institutional political resistance emancipatory on its own. Cultural Political Resistance is to be seen as relatively distinct from institutional political resistance, and more directly concerns emancipatory critique.

By arriving at emancipatory critique, teachers, as the transmitters of knowledge to students, and as active agents in the pedagogical process, can resist cultural forms that emerge out of the dominant ideology - individual success, competitiveness, egotistic desires, sexism and racism - only if they question, reflect and act on interrogating these forms. This may involve disseminating curriculum materials that raise students' awareness to their dominated lives, thus opening up possibilities of changing students' experiences. This implies alternative teacher codes and vocabularies directed in large part by a questioning of older curriculum uses. This form of critique constitutes the beginning of a language of possibility or as Giroux and Roger Simon term, (1984) "cultural politics."

Thus, questioning the very nature of conflict that has to do with prejudice, race, sex, and other stereotypes, such as masculinity and femininity, allows critique to become the language of possibility and a hope out of a determined, packaged curricula. Of course, what constitutes the difference between institutional political resistance and cultural political resistance may at times seem murky. For instance, to have more control over one's job which may include breaking school rules for instance, or having an influence on the hiring and firing of one's boss, foreman or principal, doesn't necessarily mean that there will be a change of values of workers. To assume that job control - such as teachers having a direct say over what official or pragmatic curriculum they will use - is automatically indicative of a change of values and instigates a change in consciousness, is a fallacy. Indeed it poses the question as to whether changes in the politics of job control has necessarily to do with the dominant ideological forms or the transformation of culture. Cultural agency may have something to do with teacher job control, but by no means implies an automatic movement towards fundamental cultural change. Let us see how this may look empirically.

The Hidden Curriculum - Non Emancipatory Tool

The curriculum at Hillview was manipulated and thereby controlled to suit eighth grade teacher needs - pragmatically, teachers found themselves constantly deviating from the official curriculum guidelines - a form of institutional political resistance.

Ms. A was deeply concerned that her class, which contained a number of Cambodian refugees who spoke English rather well, but did not talk much in class and were extremely difficult to motivate. As I observed the English lessons, each student was given a reading turn. It became obvious that when Ms. A questioned students after the story, many did not understand its basic principles. The literature book being used had been recommended by teachers at the high school that these students would be attending the following year. It represented part of the official curriculum. It was clear to Ms. A. that she could not use the curriculum guidelines, and as a result, had to deviate from the given curriculum to a more pragmatic one - read third grade level literature! Thus, "Sylvester and the Maggic Pebble" was used as a reader for the eighth grade class. Ms. A succeeded in meeting the class' standards. She was able to work on the themes required by the official curriculum - characterization, time and place, by resorting to the easier reading material. Furthermore, living in this pragmatic world had other serious implications for the hidden curriculum that concerned both students as well as teachers.

Students, in particular, were frustrated by the type of exercises given to them. Their anxieties, I believe, had to do in part with the ethic of hard work. Let us see how this worked.

Mr. X. would usually assign students reading assignments on topics such as "alcoholism," "disease," or "drugs." The students in Mr. X's class were used to working hard for him, thus, exercises on the whole were accepted and completed quietly. Mr. X's continual distribution of rote-memory, non-creative type exercises, prompted one student to comment that class tasks were "boring, too many words, we copy notes most of the time in class." While students were engaged in meaningless exercises, Mr. X would either leave the class for ten minutes or so, or be arguing with some administrator about a discipline procedure not dealt with in what he termed an "efficient" manner: Commented another student about the types of exercises Mr. X left his students while he was out of class:

Mr. X makes me work, work, work.

He hard man, but he still good.

It seems to me, that Mr. X promoted the ethic of hard work. Students questioned the exercises given, but on the whole succumbed to the type of "working" class exercises described by Jean Anyon (1980, 1981) in her seminal studies on the hidden curriculum and work. This hard work ethic led to other prized teacher transmitted values. This claim will be argued in the ensuing sections.

Other hidden curriculum items included: Work done on time-time on task - and rewards, or delayed gratification. Commented Ms. Y to her students:

It would be wise to do your homework - get on with the job or don't bother coming to school, and if your task is not completed in ten minutes, you'll be in the time-out room for two hours. If you do, you'll be rewarded.

Ms. Y's students were used to the hard work and reward ethic. This was one method Ms. Y used to control her students, while concurrently remaining a "friend" and easy going with them.

On one's distribution and investment of profit - commented Ms. W to her students about the upcoming candy sale:

What will we do if we sell so much candy that there will be money left over?

It seems to me, that attaining profits and/or distributing them, became a commonsensical thing to do.

Additionally, teachers of this eighth grade "team" also adjusted their curriculum by either having parties (when officially disallowed), completing administrative type tasks-like the organization of candy slip sales for the upcoming school dance - while at the same time, students read for enjoyment, in most cases, material unrelated to the official curriculum. During period 0, commonly called S.O.A.R. period (an acronym for Special Opportunities to Achieve Results) teachers were supposed

to be as they described it, "baby sitters" for their students, while students had the free time to read. Mr X commented on S.O.A.R.:

None of the students like it, me neither.
I don't think it is effective. The kids
don't know how to study. Most of it is a
waste of time; There is no study. There
is no academic achievement.

The above thoughts were shared by other eighth grade teachers as well. This prompted Mr. X. and Ms. W, for instance, to leave class for up to 20 minutes at a time and not "baby sit" their students, or even allowed Ms. A to use the S.O.A.R. period as a time to catch up on testing students who may have been absent earlier in the week and subsequently missed their tests.

The few general descriptions of institutional resistance described do show that teachers in this study did indeed have a direct say and control over what work they did, for instance, and how this work was accomplished. In short, the curriculum was teacher managed. This led teachers to believe that they had an upper hand over the administration. Yet, within the "hidden curriculum" teachers still, in the main, espoused, supported and did not even question the dominant ideological, capitalistic values that engulf our school systems, which are non-emancipatory, and it seemed to me, hegemonic! Put differently these teacher taught values refer to a body of practices, energy, lived experiences or common sense interpretations which become

our unquestioning world - an organized assemblage of meanings, wherein the central, effective and dominant system of meanings, values and actions are lived and constitute the limit of common sense knowledge. They are part of our consciousness.

While I have obviously not exhausted the implications of the hidden curriculum, we must as educators ask ourselves the questions: Do teachers and treat the ethics of hard work, rewards, compensation, delayed gratification and profit as mere common sense? Do teachers even question the effects of what these ethical and moral stances of the hidden curriculum may promote - a moral, equal and just society - or just the opposite? Are teachers simply passive bearers of the ideology? In other words, do teachers consciously deny students an emancipatory stance away from a determined, functional or otherwise put, "set" and unquestioning, uncritical view of the world, by promoting capitalistic values? Do teacher work habits - denoting teacher controlled time and space - necessarily have to always be non-emancipatory? In answer to the above questions, I want now to refer to areas of my project that indeed produced glimpses of hope - which showed that teachers could also manipulate their curriculum for emancipatory effects.

Teacher Cultural Political Resistance: The Hidden Curriculum as an Emancipatory Tool: Conscious and Unconscious.

As suggested earlier, the move from institutional political resistance to cultural political resistance is tricky. An example of cultural political resistance that had emancipatory effects and was consciously recognized by a teacher will now be described.

The movie "Mask" was shown in Ms. Y's class, as a reward and supplementary curriculum material to the current issue of discussion in class on prejudice. While the movie was in progress, Ms. Y was concerned with having free time and organizing the day by preparing other curriculum materials. In addition, she also concerned herself with the sexual assault issue that had the eighth grade team buzzing and infuriated. She wrote a letter of complaint on the team's behalf, to the principal and the area supervisor:

It is hard for us to understand that we were not informed of the incident . . . we feel it necessary that we are informed of such events when they occur - not two months later.

In all, Ms. Y is concerned with "sexism." She called the principal a "sexist," evident she said, by his non-verbal and sexist remarks to female teachers. Ms. Y acted on the sexist issue involving students in the school, by writing letters of complaint within an official teaching time-block - thus denoting

a form of institutional political resistance. Both Ms. Y and Ms. A were "torn" by the sexual assault issue. Their anguish was evident in a team meeting, where both teachers shed tears over the thoughts of their two girl students recently attacked by a male student in the school, infact, in the same grade.

While Ms. Y used her curriculum as a form of institutional political resistance, at the same time, she clearly and critically questioned the prevailing ideology that had to do with sexism - thus eliciting a cultural political resistant stance. Within her own curriculum, she tried to subvert the dominant ideology by calling her students "women" and "men." Consequently, she tried hard to treat students equally by acknowledging their individual sexuality and race, and concurrently, was not judgemental about which sex was better or worse. Her "hidden curriculum" then, can be said to be concerned with student rights to be treated equally, and with respect, irrespective of their race or sex. This was reinforced through a follow-up discussion on the movie "Mask" and its prejudicial effects in society. Importantly, students were able to voice their opinions about the movie, and be honest about some of their own past and present prejudices. Commented a student in reply to the teacher (Ms. Y's) question:

Ms. Y: Is anyone prejudiced here?

Student: I guess, well we all have a few prejudices, I mean, um, do we like everything, um

and everyone in this school?

It seems to me, that Ms. Y consciously elicited emancipatory remarks and thoughts by her students. The effect it may have had on Ms. Y and her students is cultural - it has to do with critique and meaning making. The same could be said of other eighth grade teacher uses of cultural capital. This was viewed when teachers at Hillview emphasized "cooperation," sharing and creative analytical class projects, not only rote learning exercises. This meant teaching different values from those depicting the working class. For instance, when Ms. A promoted democratic ideals by allowing her students a vote on issues that concerned them, and Ms. W's flexibility in allowing her students to decide collectively on what should be done with spare time in and out of school, represented just a few instances of cultural expression and penetrations (Willis, 1977) into the official aspects of the curriculum.

Unconscious pockets of emancipatory pedagogy were also evident at Hillview as well. This can be partly viewed by Mr. X's comments to me on class distinction:

The state department, the federal policy and this school don't want to hear about distinctions over individuals. We're not organizing the problem we have over class differences . . . this school is not recognizing the problem of illiteracy.

Mr. X was well aware that his own curriculum choice represented a reification of the working class ethic of hard work for success. Thus, while caught between the responsibility of teaching for individual student accomplishments, the reality that certain students will not change their no-work policy, and a perceived weak administration, Mr. X commented to a state department representative:

There's too much miscommunication, a lot of secrecy, and the fact that the communication between us and the people downtown is so sporadic nobody knows what anybody is doing.

The above comment can be directly related to Mr X's remarks to his students about the change from S.O.A.R. period on Monday morning to a Unified Arts period:

The principal has screwed this up; everything switches. I hope they understand what a screw-up they've done in this office.

Immediately, students glance at each other, disturbed by Mr. X, who is visibly upset by the administration's actions. After class one student commented:

Mr. X man, all he care about them over there.
(administration) We just do what he says, but its boring man.

Unawares then, Mr. X, through his frustrations with the administration and subsequent actions and language, has promoted student thoughts about the reasons for particular curriculum

usage and policy decisions. This has the potential of eliciting student critique to the possibility of questioning structural and cultural aspects of their own work habits and teachers' daily struggles. Thus, the question that one eighth grader in Mr. X's class asked - "why do we have to do all these exercises" - has multiple effects if and when students realize that part of the reason that these "working class" exercises are distributed is because there are teacher-administrator conflicts. Thus, through Mr. X's institutional political resistance - his withdrawal of consent to the teacher-administrator relationship - he promoted student questions that had something inherently to do with domination, subordination and power-knowledge relations.

Summary

In the main, however, by no means was the group/"team" of teachers in this study planning to resist or subvert the dominant ideology. Cultural political resistance denoting an emancipatory stance was secondary and the weight of importance remained at the level of the institution rather than the questioning of and changing, cultural values. I maintain, that to manipulate items of the curriculum that have to do with consciousness raising effects and which directly question the cultural political climate, may open spaces for "phronesis," or the contemplative "ideal" pursuit - an understanding of conditions of knowledge that would make up the "good life" (McCarthy, 1979) as was evidently the case with what resulted from Ms. Y's endeavours to resist the dominant ideology - student consciousness raising to

injustices mitigated in this world by color, gender and class based prejudices, and in part, by Mr. X's commitment to test board policy, which may have effected student thoughts about the nature of work and school structure. But differently, cultural political resistance has to do with what Giroux has coined, "literacy," "empowerment" and "emancipation," a questioning and sensitivity to power structures and value systems.

It seems to me, that part of the "tension" teachers of this eighth grade "team" were facing had to do with their in-school frustrations with a teacher perceived "weak" and "inferior" administration. This led to institutional resistances, which included a manipulation of the curriculum. On the one hand, these resistances only reproduced capitalistic tenents. This denied both students and teachers an emancipatory stance. On the other hand however, the hidden curriculum had its emancipatory effects as well. This was evident in particular by Ms. Y's probing questions and subsequent efforts to undermine the dominant ideology of sexism through her particular official (social studies curriculum) and pragmatic curriculum choice - what values seemed best to elicit from students that ultimately led them to question their prejudices, by Mr. X's insistant questioning of school board policy which prompted students to think about authority/heirarchical relationships, and by teachers in general allowing students to collectively make decisions.

It may just be that real emancipation initially requires the types of institutional resistances that eighth grade teachers in this study performed. This, in turn, may open spaces for questioning and interrogating the broader values and meanings of cultures. For example, in American schools today, teachers are subjected to standardized evaluation procedures and are generally overburdened with extra teacher and administrative duties. These rigid and frequently dehumanizing evaluation procedures and extra work/duties may prompt teachers to ask simple questions, like, "why is it that I am subjected to these eight evaluation categories," or "who is it that makes these evaluation procedures so stringent," or questions asked as to the nature of teacher work rights, like "why is it that I am overworked," or "what is my real function as a worker in the school process." The asking of these questions and finding out their answers may have serious emancipatory repercussions for teachers.

I have attempted to further the spheres of what 'resistance' entails by alluding to the notion that resistance to ideological forms of domination must necessarily include teachers who are ready to commit to act on emancipatory moral standards and beliefs by questioning the cultural politics of the school in particular, ie; the content of the curriculum and its ideological effects. To question the institutional politics of the school only, is but part of the battle for a counter-culture productive and transformative emancipatory individual and team stance. Only

when both spheres are questioned and acted on in the ways described above, will there be room for cultural movement against ideological barriers, where a source for further fruitful penetrations of ideological impediments will be greater realized and confronted. Then the hidden curriculum can be used as an emancipatory tool for the transformative agenda that educational researchers have been writing at length about.

It seems to me then, that the transformation of consciousness will ultimately involve conscious conflict and struggle. It will include teacher, administrator and student negotiations. Ultimately, this has something to do with the concept of 'power.' Foucault (1980), lest we forget, reminds us that power is relational. Thus, teachers possess certain power, as they are the controllers of the pragmatic uses of the curriculum. This allows them the potential to find, create and manouvre gaps in the official curriculum guide that would critique dominant ideological values and assumptions, serve the emancipatory agenda, be a part of the hidden curriculum which finally represents a move away the "fit" functionalist view of the world.

REFERENCES

- Altenbaugh, Richard. "Teachers and the workplace." Urban Education Vol. 21, No. 4, January 1987.
- Anyon, Jean. "Social class and the hidden curriculum of work" Journal of Education, 162, pp. 66-96., 1980.
- Anyon, Jean. "Social class and school knowledge." Curriculum Inquiry, 11 (1) pp. 3-42., 1981.
- Apple, Michael. W. Education and Power. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul. 1982.
- Apple, Michael. W. Teachers and Texts. New York and London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. 1986.
- Bullough, Robert V. and Gitlin, Andrew D. "Beyond control: Rethinking teacher resistance." Education and Society 3(1&2), pp. 65-75., 1985.
- Carlson, Dennis. "Teachers as political actors." Harvard Educational Review. 57 (3) pp. 283-306., 1987
- Dreeban, R. On What is Learned in Schools. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley. 1968.
- Dreeban, R. "The schools as a workplace." In J. H. Ballantine (Ed.), Schools and Society. Palo Alto and London: Mayfield, pp. 367-372., 1973.
- Foucault, M. Power and Knowledge. New York: Pantheon Books. 1980
- Freire, P. Education for Critical Consciousness. New York: The

- Continuum Publishing Corporation. 1973.
- Friere, P. The Politics of Education. Massachusetts: Bergin & Garvey Publishers, Inc. 1985.
- Giroux, H. A. Theory and Resistance in Education. Massachusetts: Bergin and Garvey Publishers, Inc. 1983.
- Giroux, H. A and Roger Simon. "Curriculum study and cultural politics." Journal of Education, Vol. 166, No. 3., pp. 226-228. 1984.
- Giroux, H. A. "Teachers and the role of the resisting intellectual." Philosophical Studies in Education. pp. 22-40. 1986.
- Giroux, H. A. "Schooling and the politics of ethics: Beyond liberal and conservative discourses." Journal of Education Vol. 169, No. 2, pp. 9-33., 1987.
- Giroux, H. A. "Literacy and the pedagogy of the voice of political empowerment." Educational Theory Winter, Vol. 38, No. 1. pp. 61-76., 1988.
- Gordon, David. "The concept of the hidden curriculum." Journal of Philosophy of Education, Vol. 16, No. 2. pp. 167-198, 1982.
- Jackson, P. W. Life in Classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. 1968.
- Kanpol, B. "The Role of teachers in the social order." Unpublished Dissertation. The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1987.

Shapiro, H. S. "Education and democracy: Constituting a counter-hegemonic discourse of educational change.

Unpublished Manuscript. Winter, 1986.

Willis, P. Learning to Labor: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs. England: Saxon House., 1977.